

# ANALYSIS OF COMPREHENSIVE RISK ASSESSMENTS ADMINISTERED IN 2016

---

Cliff Kusaj, Psy.D.

Chief Psychologist

Board of Parole Hearings

Forensic Assessment Division

# Risk Categories

Rating	Definition	Implications for Violence Recidivism
Low Risk	Non-elevated risk relative to long-term inmates and to other parolees.	Low-risk examinees are expected to commit violence much less frequently than all other parolees.
Moderate Risk	Elevated risk relative to long-term inmates and non-elevated risk relative to other parolees.	Moderate-risk examinees are expected to commit violence more frequently than Low-risk long-term parolees but less frequently than other parolees.
High Risk	Markedly elevated risk relative to long-term inmates and average risk relative to other parolees.	High-risk examinees are expected to commit violence more frequently than Low- and Moderate-risk long-term parolees and similarly to other parolees.

# Observed and Estimated Recidivism Base Rate Comparisons at Three Years Post-Release

	Determinately Sentenced Inmates Released Without Discretion in California and Other States (Observed Ranges)	Long-term Inmates Eligible for Parole Consideration (Estimated Ranges)	Long-term Inmates Granted Parole and Discretionarily Released in California (Observed Ranges)
Arrests and Convictions for Violent Crimes	20 – 25%	3 – 15%	Less than 1%
Arrests and Convictions for Nonviolent Crimes	35 – 50%	10 – 25%	1 – 5%
Return to jail or prison for arrests, convictions, and parole violations	50 – 70%	20 - 40%	5 - 10%

## Low, Moderate, and High Risk (2016)

- Of 3,150 CRAs administered in 2016, psychologists opined **(28%)** of examinees were Low Risk, **(49%)** were Moderate Risk and **(23%)** were High Risk.
- Most examinees **(77%)** were assessed by psychologists to represent non-elevated risk relative to other parolees.

## Indicators of Discriminant and Concurrent Validity

As institutional behavioral stability and rules compliance improves (as reflected in lower institutional placement scores) assessed risk (generally speaking) declines.

Risk Category	Average Placement Score
Low	22.7
Moderate	37.1
High	114.1

# Indicators of Discriminant and Concurrent Validity

As offenders age, assessed risk declines.

Risk Category	Average Age
Low	51.2
Moderate	50.5
High	48.2

## HCR-20-V3's Twenty Risk Factors Assessed to be *Present To Some Degree*

Risk Category	Average Number of Risk Factors Assessed To Be Present to Some Degree
Low	9.9 of 20 Risk Items
Moderate	13.8 of 20 Risk Items
High	16.4 of 20 Risk Items

## The Presence of Historic Problems Generally Does Not Differentiate Low, Moderate, and High Risk Inmates

Risk Category	History of Problems With Violence	History of Problems With Other Antisocial Behavior	History of Problems With Substance Use	History of Problems With Personality Disorder	History of Problems With Treatment Or Supervision Response
Low	100%	83%	77%	63%	77%
Moderate	100%	92%	88%	83%	92%
High	100%	97%	92%	91%	98%



## *Current Relevance* of Historic Problems Better Differentiates Low, Moderate, and High Risk Inmates

<b>Risk Category</b>	<b><i>Current High Relevance of History of Problems With Violence</i></b>	<b><i>Current High Relevance of History of Problems With Other Antisocial Behavior</i></b>	<b><i>Current High Relevance of History of Problems With Substance Use</i></b>	<b><i>Current High Relevance of History of Problems With Personality Disorder</i></b>	<b><i>Current High Relevance of History of Problems With Treatment Or Supervision Response</i></b>
Low	48%	33%	41%	29%	19%
Moderate	59%	49%	51%	51%	42%
High	77%	74%	64%	77%	76%

# History of Problems with Major Mental Disorder

35% of inmates were assessed to have a history of problems with major mental disorder.

Risk Category	Present to Some Degree (H6)
Low	26%
Moderate	34%
High	52%

# Recent Problems with Symptoms of Major Mental Disorder

20% of inmates were assessed to have recent problems with symptoms of major mental disorder.

Risk Category	Present to Some Degree
Low	5%
Moderate	19%
High	41%

## *Current Relevance of Recent Problems with Symptoms of Major Mental Disorder, When Present to Some Degree*

Risk Category	Low Relevance	Mod Relevance	High Relevance
Low	32%	53%	14%
Moderate	17%	53%	30%
High	10%	37%	52%

# Clinical and Risk Management Problems

Clinical *or Recent* Problems and Risk Management *or Future* Problems Better Differentiate Low, Moderate, and High Risk Inmates than *Historic* Problems.

## Recent Problems with Instability

37% of inmates were assessed to have recent problems with instability.

Risk Category	Present to Some Degree (C4)
Low	8%
Moderate	36%
High	79%

# Recent Problems with Treatment or Supervision Response

55% of inmates were assessed to have recent problems with treatment or supervision response.

Risk Category	Present to Some Degree (C5)
Low	16%
Moderate	62%
High	93%

## Recent Problems with Insight

79% of inmates were assessed to have recent problems with insight.

Risk Category	Present to Some Degree (C1)	Assessed to be Highly Relevant to Current Risk
Low	53%	2%
Moderate	91%	26%
High	99%	72%



# Future Problems with Stress or Coping (Anticipated In the Community)

90% of inmates were assessed to have future problems with stress or coping.

Risk Category	Present to Some Degree (R5)	Assessed to be Highly Relevant to Current Risk
Low	80%	21%
Moderate	96%	47%
High	99%	86%

# Psychopathy Checklist (PCL-R) Differences by Risk Category

The arithmetic average PCL-R score of inmates assessed in 2016 (13.6 and 18.5 for women and men, respectively) was about one-standard deviation below the arithmetic average PCL-R score of North American offenders (19.0 and 22.1).

	Average total PCL-R Score (0 – 40)
Low	13.6
Moderate	18.7
High	23.7

# Static-99R

Administered in 14% of risk assessments.

Static-99 Risk Category	Percent	Recidivism Estimate
Very Low Risk	2%	Non-Offender
Below Average Risk	13%	< 1%
Average Risk	46%	1.3% to 2.8%
Above Average Risk	27%	4.8%
Well Above Average Risk	10%	20.2%

# Comparing Categorical Rating Percentages

	Low	Moderate	High
2014	35%	45.5%	19.5%
2015	33.6%	48.6%	17.6%
2016	28%	49%	23%

# Comparing ISL and DSL Inmates

Risk Category	ISL (N=3,015)	DSL (N=135)
Low	29%	6%
Moderate	49%	46%
High	22%	48%

# Comparing ISL and DSL Youth Offenders

	ISL – YO	DSL – YO
Low	27%	5%
Moderate	48%	52%
High	25%	43%

# Comparing ISL and DSL Youth Offenders

	ISL – YO	DSL – YO
Average Age	45.7	31.3
PCL-R Total Score	18.4 *	19.5 *
Recent Problems With Violent Ideation or Intent	16%	29%
Recent Problems With Instability	38%	51%
Recent Problems With Treatment or Supervision Response	55%	75%
Future Problems With Living Situation	48%	76%
Future Problems with Treatment or Supervision Response	70%	91%

# Elderly Parolees

Risk Category	ELD (N=526)
Low	21%
Moderate	57%
High	23%



# Third Strike Inmates (January 2016 Through September 2017)

Risk Category	3 <sup>RD</sup> Strike (N= 105)
Low	14%
Moderate	46%
High	40%

# Third Strike Inmates (January 2016 Through September 2017)

Risk Factor	Percent Present to Some Degree	Percent Assessed to be Highly Relevant
Recent Problems with Insight	91%	56%
Recent Problems with Treatment or Supervision Response	71%	43%
Future Problems with Anticipated Treatment or Supervision Response	86%	55%
Future Problems with Anticipated Stress and Coping	95%	61%